DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 711 CG 009 228

AUTHOR Getz, Sandra K.; Herman, Jeanne B.
TITLE Sex Differences in Judgments of Male and Female Role Stereotypes.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (46th, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Life Style; Marital Status; Occupational Choice; Research Projects; *Sex Differences; Speeches; *Standards; *Stereotypes; *Success Factors

ABSTRACT

This study tests whether or not there are sex differences in judgments of the success of various male and female lifestyles, and if so, what differential standards are applied to males and females. The most interesting result of this study is that college men and women use the same standards to judge the success of male lifestyles but different standards to judge the success of female lifestyles. Results indicate that men judge divorced females with high status careers as more successful than do women. Men and women do not differ in their success ratings of divorced males holding high status jobs, but women judge other women as successful only if they are successful maritally as well as occupationally. Numerous data charts are included. (Author/PC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 099711

Sex Differences in Judgments of Male and Female Role Stereotypes

Sandra K. Getz and Jeanne B. Herman[1]

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Although the theory of need for achievement has been extensively researched for males, only recently has there been any significant amount of research done on the achievement motives of women. The major finding has been that women express significantly lower achievement motivation than men, when participating in mixed sex conditions and competitive conditions (Horner, 1972). Moreover, the majority of women tested who do have a high drive for success seem to experience conflict about having high standards of excellence (Horner, 1968). Weiss (1962) found that when women realized that they were succeeding in mixed sex groups, they lowered the level of their successes.

The major theory that tries to explain this conflict was proposed in Horner's (1968) doctoral dissertation. According to Horner, females experience conflict between striving for success and the loss of femininity associated with this striving. She proposed that this conflict, which is termed the motive to avoid success, results in an inhibition of achievement behavior.

McClelland (1953) defines need achievement as a relatively stable disposition to strive for success in any situation where standards of excellence are appropriate. In the past, need achievement was studied in the limited context of competitive situations (i.e., stereotypically male occupational roles). According to the theory, to attain success one must have competency in a specific area or areas. However, competency itself is considered a stereotypically male trait. Broverman et. al. (1972)and Sherriffs

CG 009 228

---

[1]Paper presented at Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, 1974.

and McKee (1957) report that college students portray their ideal woman as less competent than their ideal man. Bennett and Cohen (1959) report that men's scores on an instrument measuring feelings of competency were higher than women's scores. Thus, women seemed to have internalized the stereotypically female trait of less competency in comparison to males. If being competent is considered generally more of a male than female trait, it is not surprising that women feel conflict between being feminine and striving for success.

Steinman and Fox (1966, 1969) and McKee and Sherriffs' (1959) research indicates that women widely accept the typically feminine role stereotype of themselves. They reported that women believe that man's ideal woman would be markedly sex typed. In McKee and Sherriffs' study (1959) women's ideal woman and ideal self were also markedly sex typed. That is, she is submissive and places home and family above outward achievement strivings. But, males describing their ideal woman had a less restrictive view than the women thought they would have. In McKee and Sherriffs (1959) male subjects did describe women in some stereotypically feminine terms but also used such stereotypically masculine traits as aggressiveness, courageousness, dominance, and independence when describing their ideal female. Male subjects also had a broader view of women in Steinman and Fox's (1966) study. They thought that married women should crave personal success which is traditionally a masculine trait and did not think marriage and children should take precedence for women. Steinman and Fox (1966), moreover, found men were giving women contradictory clues as to what behaviors they preferred in women. Male subjects agreed that a woman should be active outside her family and use her talents to fulfill and develop herself as a person. Yet, these same male subjects disagreed with the question suggesting at some point in a woman's life these self-fulfillment goals might become

more important to her than serving her family and marriage. Thus, men's inconsistent attitudes might contribute to the conflict women feel between striving for success and achievement and fulfilling their traditionally feminine roles.

One possible explanation of the differences between male and female's expressed need for achievement is that females see achievement behaviors as inappropriate for female lifestyles. It seems likely that successful male and female lifestyles are judged against different standards. This study was designed to test whether or not there are sex differences in judgements of the success of various male and female lifestyles; and if so, to investigate what differential standards are applied to males and females.

Method

Ninety-six male and one hundred-two female college students, randomly selected from the university subject pool, participated in this questionnaire study. The sessions included both males and females. There were about thirty subjects in each session. Data were collected on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1959) dimensions of achievement, affiliation, dominance, deference and nurturance and a role stereotype questionnaire.

The role stereotype questionnaire consisted of a series of lifestyle vignettes of male or female stimulus persons including information on their occupation, marital status, age and number of children. These four demographic lifestyle dimensions were varied to reflect high and low status occupations, a broad span of ages appropriate for working people and a variety of family situations ranging from single, to married with no children, married with multiple children, to divorced with multiple children and divorced with no children. Subjects were asked to rate male or female

lifestyles on a scale of one to five, judging how successful they thought these lifestyles were. Subjects responded to either a male or female stimulus person questionnaire. Assignment of subjects to questionnaires was at random.

Subjects were divided into two groups prior to data analysis: those responding to the male stereotype questionnaire and those responding to the female stereotype scale. Principle components of the role stereotype questionnaire were determined separately for each group. Scores of male and female subjects on the rotated principle components were tested for mean differences within each group.

Results

The primary principle component of the role stereotype questionnaire for male and female stimulus persons was defined by marital status and occupational status. (see Table 1) Subjects with high scores on this dimension rated males or females who were divorced and had high status occupations as successful. Male and female subjects did not differ in their judgments of the lifestyle success of divorced males who had high status occupations (dimensionI). But, the female subjects judged divorced women who had high status jobs as significantly less successful than the male subjects judged these women ($F = 4.55$; $p \leq .05$). (see Table 2)

There were no differences between judgments of male and female subjects on the other orthogonal dimensions of the role stereotype questionnaire.

The second dimension for the male stimulus persons consisted of married men who held jobs which are stereotypically women's work and low status: secretary, hairdresser, department store clerk. Male and female subjects agreed in their judgments that these lifestyles were not very

successful, and they judged unemployed persons of both sexes for all three marital statuses as least successful.

Married professionals also formed a dimension of the judgments. Male and female subjects judged this lifestyle to be particularly successful. Subjects rated women in this lifestyle to be as successful as men with the same lifestyle. (See Table 3)

It was hypothesized that a reasonable explanation for the documented differences between male and female's expressions of need for achievement was that success for males and females was based on different lifestyle standards. The results of the role stereotype portion of this study suported the hypothesized differential standards. Further, as expected male subjects expressed significantly higher levels of need for achievement and dominance than did female subjects and females expressed higher levels of need affiliation and nurturance. (See Tables 4 and 6) However there were no significant correlations between subjects' scores on the EPPS dimensions and their judgments of success for male and female lifestyles. (See Table 7)

Discussion

The most interesting result of this study is that college men and women use the same standards to judge the success of male lifestyles while college women use different standards for judging the success of female lifestyles than the standards used by college men. The principal components analyses indicated that occupational status and marital status were the primary dimensions which male and female college students used to judge the success of both male and female lifestyles. Both male and female subjects rated male stimulus persons who were divorced but held high status jobs as successful. But female subjects rated divorced female stimulus persons who

held high status jobs as significantly less successful than male subjects. College women clearly expressed different standards for a successful female lifestyle than did the college men. A high status career seemed to be enough for the male judges to rate the female stimulus persons as successful. But for a woman to judge a woman as successful she must have both a high status job and a successful marriage, i.e., not divorced. Interestingly, the women in the sample did not require dual role success for male stimulus persons. The male subjects did not require dual role success for male or female stimulus persons.

These results converge with those reported by Steinman and Fox (1969, 1964) suggesting that women may cling to traditionally female role stereotypes more closely than men. The conflict between successfully fulfilling multiple roles may be more in the college woman's own mind, than in the expectations of her male peers, who personally represent the male population with whom her social dating interactions occur.

The related question of whether or not a woman will be judged successful by male and female college students without a career was not addressed in this particular study. However, male and female subjects rated unemployed male and female stimulus persons of all marital statuses and ages as equally unsuccessful.

It is clear from these data that college women require families as well as careers of successful women. It is uncertain whether careers as well as families are necessary for female college students to judge women's lifestyles as successful. If women's standards for themselves require success in both roles and male standards do not, we anticipate that women may have problems in meeting their high standards in multiple roles and in communicating such standards and the frustrations of not achieving both to men.

Table 1

Rotated Principal Components of the Role Stereotype Questionnaire

	Male Stimulus Person				Female Stimulus Person			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
1. Married, 25 years old, no children, secretary	-.01	.50	.04	.12	-.10	.02	.63	-.01
2. Divorced, 42 years old, three children, interior decorator.	.53	.02	.11	.44	.53	.19	.11	.08
3. Married, 32 years old, four children, engineer	-.25	.04	.43	.00	.18	.50	.11	.08
4. Married, 40 years old, no children, professor at university.	.08	.33	.52	.06	.63	.12	.17	.04
5. Divorced, 27 years old, three children, physical therapist.	.34	.20	.22	.65	.65	.20	-.02	.37
6. Married, 34 years old, two children, computer programmer	-.14	.57	.31	.08	.02	.49	.26	.20
7. Divorced, 46 years old, one child, architect.	.72	-.17	.02	.18	.79	.19	-.07	.26
8. Divorced, 28 years old, four children, lawyer.	.57	.24	.27	.44	.78	.28	-.27	.14
9. Single, 36 years old, head resident nurse.	.30	.36	.13	.04	.39	.17	.41	.08
10. Divorced, 29 years old, three children, dietician.	.24	-.02	.13	.63	.69	.26	.12	.39
11. Married, 45 years old, three children, professor at university.	-.34	.24	.58	.00	.22	.69	.06	-.03
12. Married, 38 years old, no children, secretary.	-.12	.61	-.01	.09	.17	-.07	.73	.05
13. Divorced, 26 years old, two children, supporting actress on Broadway	.36	.00	.17	.41	.48	.04	.04	.23
14. Divorced, 27 years old, no children, clerk in department store	.40	.38	-.12	.35	.28	-.27	.37	.52
15. Married, 47 years old, two children, journalist on newspaper.	.11	.40	.09	-.30	-.14	.51	.41	.05

Table 1

	Male Stimulus Person				Female Stimulus Person			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
16. Divorced, 41 years old, no children, career counselor.	.50	.40	.01	.26	.57	.02	.31	.48
17. Single, 25 years old, interior decorator	.33	.51	.08	-.16	.29	.13	.42	.04
18. Divorced, 35 years old, two children, owner of small insurance company.	.63	.13	-.07	.18	.69	.15	-.17	.06
19. Married, 43 years old, three children, hairdresser.	-.09	.64	.06	.07	-.48	.28	.40	.29
20. Married, 26 years old, no children, lawyer.	.34	.10	.60	-.11	.48	.32	.22	-.27
21. Married, 36 years old, three children, doctor.	.20	-.08	.80	-.16	.31	.70	.16	-.27
22. Divorced, 44 years old, no children, vice president for bank.	.84	.01	.03	.11	.82	.15	-.01	-.05
23. Divorced, 37 years old, three children, doctor.	.78	-.27	.27	.25	.78	.34	-.22	.08
24. Married, 37 years old, one child, clerk in department store.	-.11	.66	.01	.03	-.41	.15	154	.27
25. Single, 43 years old, illustrator for magazine.	.60	.39	-.15	-.05	.59	.06	.52	.03
26. Single, 36 years old, Senator.	.53	.09	.41	-.07	.56	-.04	.17	-.07
27. Married, 27 years old, two children, unemployed.	-.24	.54	-.08	.14	-.36	.05	.25	.33
28. Divorced, 34 years old, one child, lawyer.	.69	-.22	.27	.24	.83	.23	-.17	.07
29. Divorced, 24 years old, three children, writer of childrens' books.	.57	.07	.06	.37	.69	.20	-.02	.36
30. Married, 29 years old, two children, psychiatrist.	.03	-.09	.61	.04	.23	.60	.09	-.12
31. Married, 29 years old, three children, news reporter.	.04	.47	.32	-.29	.19	.60	.28	.05
32. Divorced, 36 years old, two children, unemployed.	-.01	.31	-.22	.48	-.19	-.13	-.05	.66

Table 1

	Male Stimulus Person				Female Stimulus Person			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
33. Divorced, 46 years old, two children, hairdresser.	.34	.37	-.22	.36	.21	-.06	.12	.79
34. Married, 47 years old, four children, optometrist.	.12	.07	.70	-.09	.15	.68	.01	-.01
35. Married, 35 years old, two children, doctor.	.11	-.01	.68	-.20	.25	.79	-.15	-.20
36. Married, 25 years old, one child, advertising executive.	.42	.10	.27	-.45	.24	.69	.10	-.12
37. Divorced, 36 years old, no children, architect.	.86	.17	.01	.06	.83	.14	.00	.15
38. Single, 23 years old, secretary.	.03	.71	-.14	.03	-.09	.07	.70	.09
39. Single, 35 years old, hairdresser.	.14	.71	-.17	-.01	.00	-.05	.67	.42
40. Married, 42 years old, no children, college counselor.	.23	.58	.23	-.11	.20	.06	.58	.12
41. Married, 35 years old, no children, dentist.	.55	.18	.54	.00	.54	.28	.44	-.26
42. Divorced, 37 years old, no children, social work (master in social work).	.58	.33	.10	.04	.66	-.03	.39	.19
43. Divorced, 25 years old, no children, editor of magazine.	.75	.10	.18	.24	.71	.02	.06	.08
44. Married, 27 years old, three children, psychiatrist.	.05	-.14	.64	.12	.24	.75	-.03	-.13
45. Married, 28 years old, three children, high school teacher.	-.36	.41	.44	.04	-.28	.66	.14	.21
46. Single, 26 years old, lawyer.	.42	.09	.42	-.17	.62	.32	.21	-.30
47. Married, 48 years old, two children, architect.	.22	.11	.41	-.53	.43	.62	.11	-.04
48. Divorced, 43 years old, no children, accountant.	.60	.12	.02	.01	.68	.03	.32	.22

Table 1

		Male Stimulus Person				Female Stimulus Person			
		I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
49.	Single, 47 years old, teacher's aid.	.20	.57	.05	.21	.17	-.12	.42	.52
50.	Divorced, 46 years old, four children, veterinarian.	.53	-.12	.18	.35	.73	.22	-.12	.31
51.	Divorced, 46 years old, two children, nurse's aid.	.14	.25	-.12	.40	.30	.18	.26	.60
52.	Married, 47 years old, two children, secretary.	-.28	.75	.10	.10	-.40	.37	.41	.26
53.	Married, 43 years old, no children, dentist.	.67	.23	.28	.00	.58	.31	.33	-.22
54.	Married, 35 years old, no children, professor at university.	.36	.51	.44	-.17	.57	.22	.29	-.16
55.	Divorced, 46 years old, one child, architect.	.84	-.11	.04	.06	.80	.15	-.05	.24
56.	Married, 27 years old, no children, middle management in industry.	.31	.43	.11	-.48	.23	.24	.12	.08
57.	Married, 36 years old, three children, secretary.	-.31	.64	.10	.15	-.29	.41	.47	.30
58.	Divorced, 43 years old, no children, accountant.	.60	.12	.02	.01	.68	.03	.32	.22
59.	Divorced, 37 years old, three children, hair dresser.	.21	.42	-.21	.55	.37	-.01	.16	.68
60.	Divorced, 44 years old, four children, meter reader.	.14	.33	-.18	.52	.27	-.11	.15	.67
61.	Single, 47 years old, doctor.	.67	.09	.37	-.18	.73	.14	.15	-.16
	% Variance	45	21	17	16	38	27	20	14

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of Four Orthogonal Dimensions of the Role Stereotype Questionnaire

	Male Stimulus Persons				Female Stimulus Persons			
Dimension I Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between	1	.68	.68	.67	1	4.43	4.43	4.55
Within	74	75.31	1.02		88	85.57	.97	
Total	75	76.00			89	90.00		
Dimension II Source								
Between	1	2.45	2.45	2.47	1	.99	.92	.91
Within	74	73.54	.99		88	89.08	1.01	
Total	75	76.00			89	89.99		
Dimension III Source								
Between	1	.07	.07	.07	1	.04	.004	.004
Within	74	75.93	1.03		88	89.99	1.02	
Total	75	76.00			89	89.99		
Dimension IV Source								
Between	1	.41	.41	.40	1	.19	.19	.184
Within	74	75.59	1.02		88	89.81	1.02	
Total	75	75.99			89	90.00		

Table 3

Group Means and Standard Deviations on the Role Stereotype Questionnaire

	Male Stimulus Person			Female Stimulus Person		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Dimension I						
Males	.09	.97	40	.22	.88	46
Females	-.10	1.05	36	-.23	1.09	44
Dimension II						
Males	.17	1.14	40	.10	.96	46
Females	-.19	.86	36	-.10	1.06	44
Dimension III						
Males	.03	1.04	40	-.06	.92	46
Females	-.03	.98	36	.007	1.10	44
Dimension IV						
Males	.07	1.11	40	.04	.97	46
Females	-.08	.89	36	-.05	1.05	44

Table 4

Group Means and Standard Deviations on the EPPS Dimensions

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Achievement			
Males	14.59	4.33	96
Females	13.20	3.78	102
Affiliation			
Males	12.59	3.71	96
Females	14.63	3.50	102
Deference			
Males	8.91	3.14	96
Females	9.71	3.32	102
Dominance			
Males	11.80	4.21	96
Females	9.22	3.57	102
Nurturance			
Males	14.54	4.94	96
Females	17.52	4.59	102

Table 5

Analysis of Variance of the EPPS Dimensions

Achievement Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Significance Level
Between	1	96.61	96.61	5.87	$p \leq .05$
Within	196	3223.23	16.45		
Total	197	3319.84			
Affiliation					
Source					
Between	1	204.54	204.54	15.70	$p \leq .01$
Within	196	2547.00	12.99		
Total	197	2751.54			
Deference					
Source					
Between	1	31.62	31.62	3.02	NS
Within	196	2047.33	10.44		
Total	197	2078.90			
Dominence					
Source					
Between	1	330.82	33.08	21.77	$p \leq .01$
Within	196	2978.49	15.20		
Total	197	3309.31			
Nurturance					
Source					
Between	1	438.57	438.57	19.34	$p \leq .01$
Within	196	4443.29	22.67		
Total	197	4881.86			

Table 6

Correlations Among Subject Demographic Characteristics, EPPs Dimensions and the Role Stereotype Questionnaire

Subjects Responding to the Male Stimulus Person

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Sex*	1.00													
2.	Father's Occupational Status	-.04	1.00												
3.	Father's Educational Level	.01	-.59	1.00											
4.	Mother's Occupational Status	-.02	.16	-.21	1.00										
5.	Mother's Educational Level	.13	-.34	.49	-.35	1.00									
6.	Achievement	-.17	-.02	-.10	.10	-.08	1.00								
7.	Affiliation	.27	-.04	.16	.09	.04	-.08	1.00							
8.	Deference	.18	-.05	-.09	.01	-.02	-.16	.10	1.00						
9.	Dominance	-.39	-.04	.10	.04	.02	.12	-.21	-.07	1.00					
10.	Nurturance	.25	.03	.11	-.13	-.04	-.35	.38	.15	-.21	1.00				
11.	Male Dimension I	.14	-.00	-.01	-.12	.09	.01	.13	-.06	.07	-.06	1.00			
12.	Male Dimension II	.16	-.00	.04	.03	-.05	.02	.13	-.01	-.02	.12	.00	1.00		
13.	Male Dimension III	.14	-.29	.04	-.28	.25	-.04	-.05	-.03	.10	-.10	.00	.00	1.00	
14.	Male Dimension IV	-.02	-.11	-.02	-.04	-.06	.04	.10	-.06	.06	.19	.00	.00	.00	1.00

N = 100; r = .19; p ≦ .05

Subjects Responding to the Female Stimulus Person

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Sex*	1.00													
2.	Father's Occupational Status	.02	1.00												
3.	Father's Educational Level	-.14	-.61	1.00											
4.	Mother's Occupational Status	-.03	-.03	.16	1.00										
5.	Mother's Educational Level	-.01	-.18	.30	.38	1.00									
6.	Achievement	-.16	.10	.03	.00	.00	1.00								
7.	Affiliation	.27	-.23	.03	.04	.01	-.30	1.00							
8.	Deference	.07	-.11	.02	-.07	.01	.03	.00	1.00						
9.	Dominance	-.24	.09	-.03	-.09	-.02	.21	-.10	-.18	1.00					
10.	Nurturance	.35	-.24	.01	.00	-.04	-.42	.65	-.01	-.27	1.00				
11.	Female Dimension I	.21	.13	-.10	.02	-.10	.09	.00	-.08	.04	-.08	1.00			
12.	Female Dimension II	.07	.00	.08	-.11	.07	.18	-.22	-.02	-.05	-.01	.00	1.00		
13.	Female Dimension III	.04	.08	-.04	.00	.00	-.16	.01	.03	-.09	-.07	.00	.00	1.00	
14.	Female Dimension IV	.05	.02	-.08	-.12	.11	-.09	.08	.05	-.05	.14	.00	.00	.00	1.00

N = 96; r = .20; p ≦ .05

*Male = 1, Female = 2

References

Bennett, E. M., & Cohen, L. R. Men and Women: Personality patterns and contrasts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 59, 101-155.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkratz, P. S. Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Manual Revised 1959, The Psychological Corporation.

Horner, M. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Ann Arbor, Mich. 1968, xv 2881.

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 157-176.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. R., Clark, R. A. and Lowell, E. R. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1953.

McKee, J. P., & Sherriffs, A. C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.

Sherriffs, A. C., & McKee, J. P. Qualitiative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 451-464.

Steinmann, A., & Fox, D. J. Specific areas of agreement and conflict in women's self-perception of men's ideal women in two South American urban communities and an urban community in the United States. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 281-289.

Steinmann, A., & Fox, D. J. Male-female perceptions of the female role in the United States. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64(2), 265-276.

Weiss, P. Some aspects of femininity. Dissertations Abstracts, 1962, 23, 1083.